

MAR. 21. 2005 3:15PM 513 241 6234

NO. 0717 P. 5

APPENDIX A



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
P.O. Box 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

2005 FEB 16 PM 2:05

WOOD, HERRON & EVANS

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 21 2005

JIGR 02-05

Paper No: \_\_\_\_\_

WOOD, HERRON  
& EVANS, LLP (LEAR)  
2700 CAREW TOWER  
441 VINE STREET  
CINCINNATI OH 45202

COPY MAILED

FEB 11 2005

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of :  
Radu, et al. :  
Application No. 10/711,636 : DECISION ON PETITION  
Filed: 29 September, 2004 :  
Attorney Docket No.: MASL-52 :  
:

This is a decision on the petition filed on 27 December, 2004 under 37 C.F.R. §1.47(a).

The petition is DISMISSED.

NOTES:

- (1) Any request for reconsideration of this decision must be submitted within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.47(a)."
- (2) There will be no further reconsideration thereafter.

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

The record reflects that:

- the instant application was received and given a filing date of 29 September, 2004,

Application No. 10/711,636

2

without, *inter alia*, a fully executed oath/declaration;

- the Office mailed a Notice of Missing Parts on 25 October, 2004;
- Petitioner Kevin G. Rooney (Reg. No. 36,330) has filed, *inter alia*, a statement by Steven Benintendi (Reg. No. 56,297) and a copy of an oath/declaration signed by name co-inventor Dry, but without the signature of non-signing inventor Bogdan Radu. (Mr. Radu), has stated a "last known address" for him, and has made a statement that he has tried to reach Mr. Radu (through counsel), the transmittal letters placed in evidence by Petitioner and alleged to have been sent to Mr. Radu clearly indicate that only an oath/declaration, and not a copy of the entire application (description, claims, drawings) were mailed to the non-signing inventor Mr. Radu in an effort to contact him and have him execute the oath/declaration.

### ANALYSIS

The commentary at MPEP §409.03(d) states:

\* \* \*

Where a refusal of the inventor to sign the application papers is alleged, the circumstances of the presentation of the application papers and of the refusal must be specified in a statement of facts by the person who presented the inventor with the application papers and/or to whom the refusal was made. Statements by a party not present when an oral refusal is made will not be accepted.

Proof that a bona fide attempt was made to present a copy of the application papers (specification, including claims, drawings, and oath or declaration) to the nonsigning inventor for signature, but the inventor refused to accept delivery of the papers or expressly stated that the application papers should not be sent, may be sufficient. When there is an express oral refusal, that fact along with the time and place of the refusal must be stated in the statement of facts. When there is an express written refusal, a copy of the document evidencing that refusal must be made part of the statement of facts. The document may be redacted to remove material not related to the inventor's reasons for refusal.

The commentary at MPEP §409.03(d) provides:

#### **409.03(d) Proof of Unavailability or Refusal**

**INVENTOR CANNOT BE REACHED**

Application No. 10/711,636

3

Where inability to find or reach a nonsigning inventor "after diligent effort" is the reason for filing under 37 C.F.R. §1.47, a statement of facts should be submitted that fully describes the exact facts which are relied on to establish that a diligent effort was made.

The fact that a nonsigning inventor is on vacation or out of town and is therefore temporarily unavailable to sign the declaration is not an acceptable reason for filing under 37 C.F.R. §1.47..

Furthermore, the fact that an inventor is hospitalized and/or is not conscious is not an acceptable reason for filing under 37 C.F.R. §1.47. 37 C.F.R. §1.43 may be available under these circumstances. See MPEP §409.02. Such a petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.47 will be dismissed as inappropriate.

The statement of facts must be signed, where at all possible, by a person having firsthand knowledge of the facts recited therein. Statements based on hearsay will not normally be accepted. Copies of documentary evidence such as internet searches, certified mail return receipts, cover letters of instructions, telegrams, that support a finding that the nonsigning inventor could not be found or reached should be made part of the statement. The steps taken to locate the whereabouts of the nonsigning inventor should be included statement of facts. It is important that the statement contain facts as opposed to conclusions.

#### REFUSAL TO JOIN

A refusal by an inventor to sign an oath or declaration when the inventor has not been presented with the application papers does not itself suggest that the inventor is refusing to join the application unless it is clear that the inventor understands exactly what he or she is being asked to sign and refuses to accept the application papers. A copy of the application papers should be sent to the last known address of the nonsigning inventor, or, if the nonsigning inventor is represented by counsel, to the address of the nonsigning inventor's attorney. The fact that an application may contain proprietary information does not relieve the 37 C.F.R. §1.47 applicant of the responsibility to present the application papers to the inventor if the inventor is willing to receive the papers in order to sign the oath or declaration. It is noted that the inventor may obtain a complete copy of the application, unless the inventor has assigned his or her interest in the application, and the assignee has requested that the inventor not be permitted access. See MPEP § 106. It is reasonable to require that the inventor be presented with the application papers before a petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.47 is granted since such a procedure ensures that the inventor is apprised of the application to which the oath or declaration is directed. In re Gray, 115 USPQ 80 (Comm'r Pat. 1956).

Application No. 10/711,636

4

Where a refusal of the inventor to sign the application papers is alleged, the circumstances of the presentation of the application papers and of the refusal must be specified in a statement of facts by the person who presented the inventor with the application papers and/or to whom the refusal was made. Statements by a party not present when an oral refusal is made will not be accepted.

Proof that a bona fide attempt was made to present a copy of the application papers (specification, including claims, drawings, and oath or declaration) to the nonsigning inventor for signature, but the inventor refused to accept delivery of the papers or expressly stated that the application papers should not be sent, may be sufficient.

When there is an express oral refusal, that fact along with the time and place of the refusal must be stated in the statement of facts. When there is an express written refusal, a copy of the document evidencing that refusal must be made part of the statement of facts. The document may be redacted to remove material not related to the inventor's reasons for refusal.

When it is concluded by the 37 C.F.R. §1.47 applicant that a nonsigning inventor's conduct constitutes a refusal, all facts upon which that conclusion is based should be stated in the statement of facts in support of the petition or directly in the petition. If there is documentary evidence to support facts alleged in the petition or in any statement of facts, such evidence should be submitted. Whenever a nonsigning inventor gives a reason for refusing to sign the application oath or declaration, that reason should be stated in the petition.

Thus, not only must a copy of the entire application must be sent to the last known address of the non-signing inventor (or the estate representative) with a request that he/she sign the declaration for the patent application—and evidence of that transmittal submitted (a reasonable effort must be made to ascertain a current or last known address)—but also the petition (with fee) must state over the signature and registration number of the Petitioner the last known address (and, if appropriate, evidence of the due diligence effort ascertaining same).

Alternatively, an oath or declaration for the patent application in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §§1.63 and 1.64 must be presented.

The declaration must set forth the inventor's residence, citizenship and post office address. An oath or declaration in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §§1.63 and 1.64 signed by the Rule 1.47 applicant is required.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See: MPEP 409.03(b).

Application No. 10/711,636

5

## CONCLUSION

Therefore, the instant petition hereby is dismissed.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail: Commissioner for Patents<sup>2</sup>  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By FAX: (703) 872-9306 (IFW Formal Filings)  
ATTN.: Office of Petitions

By hand: Mail Stop: Petition  
Customer Service Window  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Telephone inquiries regarding this decision should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3214.



John J. Gillon, Jr.  
Senior Attorney  
Office of Petitions

<sup>2</sup> To determine the appropriate addressee for other subject-specific correspondence, refer to the USPTO Web site at [www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov).